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In these turbulent times, law enforcement agencies must employ the most qualified personnel to ensure preservation of both democratic principles and public safety. The exploratory research this paper presents examines the performance of New York City police officers who were members of three distinct groups: officers who entered with cadet background, officers who were college graduates but not cadets, and officers who entered with a high school diploma only. Results indicate that both cadets and college graduates outperform those officers who entered the Department with only a high school diploma, suggesting that higher education has a positive effect on policing. Future research needs to focus on the value of the cadet model to law enforcement.

It was only after the horrific attacks on September 11, 2001, that the possible consequences of terrorist activity (e.g., massive civilian casualties) came to the forefront of American consciousness. Today, preventing future attacks is a priority. It is the duty of law enforcement in free countries to prevent such horrible acts while at the same time to protect basic rights bestowed on every citizen (e.g., free speech, the right to be free from unreasonable search and seizure)—a difficult task indeed. In this new age, police agencies will value college-educated officers highly because of the varied knowledge, skills, and abilities that will be necessary to properly perform law enforcement duties.

Unfortunately, attracting highly motivated and well-educated individuals to a career in law enforcement is a struggle for law enforcement agencies. For example, the New York City Police Department has recently had great difficulty meeting its targets for recruitment (including post 9/11). Additionally, those candidates who were hired in New York City are “failing out of academy classes and being disciplined for violating department rules at twice the rate they were four years ago . . . ” (Jones, 2001, p. D1). At least part of the reason for this recruitment difficulty is that many young and spirited college graduates see law enforcement as a career of last resort. Countless explanations for this phenomena include relatively low pay for police work, the danger and stress of the work environment, many alternatives in career choice, and negative press coverage of police behavior (e.g.,
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Rodney King in Los Angeles, Abner Louima in New York City, Amadou Diallo in New York City). One recent study on police hiring conducted by Larry Hoover divides the reasons why it is so difficult for police agencies to recruit into four categories: the economy, occupational prestige, working conditions, and a “cumbersome and tedious application process” (2001, p. 2).

In an attempt to address these issues, many departments are instituting innovative strategies. One strategy is to recruit officer candidates while they are still in college. Departments give these candidates money and other assistance in exchange for a commitment to serve as police officers. This strategy is known as the Police Cadet Corps in New York City.

The New York City Police Department (NYCPD) founded the Police Cadet Corps program in 1986. The Cadet Corps is similar to the Army R.O.T.C. program. Generally, cadets are hired after completing two years of college. They receive money to complete their four-year degrees in exchange for a two-year commitment to become police officers in the NYCPD. Additionally, cadets are hired part-time during the school year and full-time during the summers to assist and train with the NYCPD.

Cadets are originally hired by the Commanding Officer of the Cadet Corps (as opposed to selection based on a civil service list from which all other police officers are hired). The Cadet Corps has its own staff and recruits its candidates separately from the rest of the NYCPD. For cadets to be hired in New York City, they have to go through a screening process that is similar to the typical civil service police officer entry (a psychological screening, physical test, medical evaluation, and background investigation).

During the two-year period in which cadets are going to college, they receive specialized instruction to enhance their ability and skills for use when they eventually become police officers. Newly hired cadets are given 10 weeks of training during their first summer with the department. The training given to cadets includes rules and procedures governing cadets; a Leadership Reaction Course; modified Police Academy courses (i.e., police science, social science, law, and physical education courses); and tours and hands-on experience with NYCPD units, the courts, and museums.

After graduating college, cadets must pass the typical civil service written examination to become police officers. Most cadets have no problem passing this test. However, upon passing the cadet is not put on a civil service list the way other test takers are; rather, the test for them is considered a promotion examination. Therefore, as long as the cadet passes the civil service examination, he/she is placed in the next available class regardless of the score (again, as long as it is passing). Also, to be placed into the next recruit class, the cadet must, again, pass psychological, physical, and medical screenings as well as undergo an updated background investigation. If cadets pass
these qualifications, they are given one day of seniority over the rest of the recruit class (civil service entries). As soon as the cadets become police officers the two-year commitment begins.

**Literature Review**

Higher education is a key component to the Cadet Corps program. A plethora of studies on education and policing have been completed, but few specifically discuss cadets. To familiarize the reader with some of these studies, I will provide a brief overview.

Generally, the results from these studies are quite mixed. One study conducted by Dantzker (1993) shows the importance of education level. He shows that the more education an officer has, the more satisfied that officer is with the job. However, those officers who have more than five years of service and also have a college education are least likely to be satisfied with their work. College educated officers, then, seem to become disillusioned quickly.

Regarding performance, Kappeler, Sapp, and Carter (1992) find that officers with college degrees get fewer civilian complaints; yet, there is no difference in violations of agency rules and procedures. Interestingly, a study by Hooper (1988) shows that officers’ performance varies with their education. This relationship is not one that is typically hypothesized (i.e., those with higher education will generally perform better); rather, Hooper argues that each level of education has strengths. For example, officers with high school education get better field evaluations, those with two-year degrees have the lowest sick time occurrence and complaints, and those with four-year degrees have the best Police Academy records and proficiency ratings on written reports. Sherman and Blumberg (1981) come to mixed results regarding the relationship between the use of force and education. Griffin (1980) states that college education should not be used as a primary selection criterion because there was no relationship between patrol officers' performance and different levels of education; however, this conclusion was based on a study of only 93 officers in one Midwestern city.

Overall, the empirical evidence regarding education and performance is quite conflicting. For example, studies not previously mentioned such as Smith (1978), Cascio (1977), Robey (1978), and Heffernan and Lovely (1991) show improved performance with education. Yet other studies do not support such a relationship, including those conducted by Weiner (1974), Worden (1990), and Blumberg and Niederhoffer (1985).

Research on the Cadet Corps or similar programs, on the other hand, is extremely sparse. Osterburg and Trubitt (1970) conducted one qualitative study. They list a number of recommendations regarding such programs, most of which New York City seems to have adopted. A more recent study was conducted by the Police Foundation (1992). They
too examined the experience of the New York City Cadet Corps. Their results suggest that the few numbers hired did not really influence the number of college graduates on the department; the program assists minority recruitment; community policing may increase with cadets as police officers; and it is not known whether cadets are future leaders.

Proponents of the Cadet Corps often state that cadets make the best police officers. They argue that it is a small price to pay to hire those most suited to be officers. Statements such as "The Cadet Corps . . . selects the most qualified candidates for its elite ranks. . . ." (NYCPD, 1996, p. 11) are commonplace in NYCPD documents. Are such statements rhetoric or fact? Is such a program suitable for other agencies? To answer these questions, this research focuses on the performance of cadets as police officers. The basic research question is, do former cadets (who are now police officers) perform better than other officers?

Methods

To determine to what extent cadets differ from other officers, this research compared three groups: cadets (who became police officers), college graduate officers (who were never cadets), and high school graduate officers (including those with generalized equivalency diplomas [GEDs]). The study identified 86 officers in each group (cadets, college graduates, and high school graduates, including GEDs). The total sample size is 258. The sample includes the total number of officers hired during 1988 and 1989 who matched characteristics. Officers in each group were matched by the year they entered the Police Academy, their sex, and their education level. Matching these characteristics allows an element of control for any influence these characteristics might have. That is, since each group has the same number of officers with the above characteristics, we can reasonably assume that relationships found are probably not due to the influence of the matched characteristics.

The subjects of the study were all hired as police officers in 1988 or 1989. These years were chosen because officers had accumulated enough activity as police officers for the researcher to assess their performance. In other words, those cadets hired in later years did not have enough time working as police officers to develop patterns of activity for comparison. The former cadets used in this study were the first to graduate from the program to police officers.

This exploratory study has limitations. The cadet program informed these officers (when they were cadets and afterward) that they would be scrutinized greatly by the NYCPD. Clearly cadets were treated with special attention compared with other officers. For example, supervisors conducted interviews with all former cadets, informing them of possible career options as well as letting them know they were being watched. Officers
hired through the civil service system did not receive such treatment. This could adversely influence the research, especially through the Hawthorne effect (i.e., subjects improve their performance simply because they know they are being closely studied [see Babbie, 1989, pp. 212–216]). Consequently, the performance of the cadets may have been weaker had this special attention not been given.

The sample is approximately 21% female (see Table 1). This figure is slightly higher than the current percentage of females working for the NYCPD, which is about 16% (NYCPD, 1995). Additionally, the majority of officers are from the 1989 class.

The researcher gathered as much information on the three groups as possible. The information includes promotions, arrest activity, number of department vehicle accidents, number and type of civilian complaints, the number of Central Personnel Index (CPI) points, and sick records. I will briefly explain these measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Sex by Police Recruit Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CPI points are a measure of discipline or poor performance. Officers that have more points have been disciplined for poor behavior. Categories known as Chronic A and Chronic B divide sick records. Chronic A is four times sick within one year. Chronic B indicates an officer who has claimed sickness six times or more within one year or four times sick plus more than 40 workdays lost. Thus, an officer on Chronic B is considered more of a problem (i.e., possibly abusing sick privileges) compared with an officer listed as Chronic A.

Civilian complaints occur when a civilian officially complains to the Civilian Complaint Review Board (CCRB) about an officer who uses unnecessary force, abuses his/her authority, is discourteous, and/or uses offensive language. Thus, the greater the count of civilian complaints for a particular officer, the more likely that officer is a poor performer (although this is not necessarily the case as it may simply indicate an officer’s willingness to do his/her job, the area the officer is assigned to, or other such factors).

The dependent variables for the study are the various department measures for each officer (current rank, sick category, CPI points, arrests [total, felony, misdemeanor, violation,
and resisting), department vehicle accidents, and civilian complaints. The independent variable is the category of the officers’ education: cadet (college graduate), non-cadet college graduate, or high school graduate only (no college education). Additionally, the study controls for the various characteristics of the officers (i.e., gender, year hired). Because many undergraduates and others with minimal statistical expertise will read this work, the study uses basic statistics (univariate and bivariate analysis).

Results

Rank

One indicator of advancement in the NYCPD, or in any police department, is rank. Police officer is the lowest rank for a uniformed member of the NYCPD. Detective is considered a promotion; however, detectives still have the civil service rank of police officer and cannot give an order to a police officer to perform a duty. Detectives are appointed at the discretion of the Police Commissioner (the highest ranking member of the NYCPD). The rank of sergeant, on the other hand, is a civil service promotion. Those who attain the rank of sergeant must pass a civil service test (usually a written multiple choice type test). Sergeants may give orders to detectives or police officers. Thus, the rank of detective is discretionary, while the rank of sergeant is based on examination.

As stated, cadets have received special attention from the NYCPD. This, of course, influences promotions (especially discretionary ones). Therefore, we expect cadets, due to their special status in the NYCPD, to be over-represented in the rank of detective. Additionally, since cadets have more college education than high school graduates, we expect them to perform better on the civil service promotional examination to sergeant.

The first comparison of groups, therefore, is accomplished for rank (see Table 2). Cadets have a greater number of detectives and sergeants than the other two groups. Those officers with only a high school education have the fewest promoted.

Looking at each rank we see that cadets are promoted to higher ranks more often compared with the other two groups. However, because promotion to the rank of detective is most likely due to the favored status of cadets, it is not a good criterion for estimating success on the job. Cadets also do better on the civil service examinations (promotion to sergeant) compared with both other groups. While we clearly expect cadets to perform better than high school graduates, it was somewhat of a surprise to see them outperform other college graduates on the written test for sergeant. This finding certainly indicates superior performance by cadets and may be due to familiarity with the job and the civil service system. Furthermore, the measure of association shows that the relationship between rank and group designation is modest (Cramer’s V = .20) and that the probability
of a result of this size occurring by chance is small ($p < .01$). Thus, this result is statistically significant.

**Table 2. Rank by Group Designation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Cadet</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>HS/GED</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detective</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Officer Female</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Officer Male</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Figures in all tables may not add to 100% due to rounding. 
$V = .20$  $p < .01$

**Sick Category**

Another comparison was accomplished for chronic sick category (see Table 3). The college category had the fewest number of chronic sick officers (2—1 in Chronic A and 1 in Chronic B). Next, were the cadets, who had six officers listed as either Chronic A or B. Lastly, the high school category had twice the number of officers as the cadets who were listed as being chronic (12). Because the "chronic" designation is an indication of poor performance, it appears (although the numbers are small) that cadets, while out-performing the high school group, do not perform as well as the college only group. As with rank, this finding too may be due to familiarity with the NYCPD; however, in this instance the familiarity with the department seems to lead to poor performance. That is, since former cadets are more familiar with sick policies, they may be better able to gauge what they can get away with. Therefore, cadets are more likely to abuse sick time than the typical college graduate. The measure of association indicates a very modest association (Cramer's $V = .14$) and the probability of this result occurring by chance is slight ($p < .05$).

**CPI Points**

The first comparison is for total confidential performance index (CPI) points. Again, the more CPI points an officer has, the worse the performance. College graduates had the fewest points (mean = 4.35); cadets were a close second (mean = 4.80), and high school
graduates had almost two times as many points (mean = 8.12). Analysis of variance indicates that we can reject the null hypothesis that the population means are equal ($p < .01$). It appears, then, that college graduates and cadets act in a very similar manner with respect to CPI points. Further, they outperform the high school only category by being disciplined only about one half the time as the members of the high school group.

### Table 3. Chronic Sick Category by Group Designation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chronic Category</th>
<th>Cadet</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>High School</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Chronic</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>92.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$V = .14$  $p < .05$

### Arrests

Another indicator of performance the study compared was arrest activity. For total arrests college graduates have the greatest number (mean = 70.03) with cadets close behind (mean = 69.90). High school graduates averaged the fewest arrests of the three groups (mean = 59.34). Other arrest indicators showed that cadets had the most felony arrests, college graduates had the most misdemeanor arrests, and high school graduates had the most violation arrests. Again, college graduates and cadets tend to outperform high school only graduates; however, neither the difference of about 10 arrests for the total category nor the difference in other arrest categories (misdemeanors and violations) was overwhelming. Analysis of variance for all arrest variables indicates that no group differs significantly from another: total arrests, $p = .44$; felony arrests, $p = .38$; misdemeanor arrests, $p = .44$; violation arrests, $p = .14$; resisting arrests, $p = .55$. Thus, the differences observed between groups could be due to chance.

Interestingly, college graduates had the most resisting arrests (6.36); however, the difference between the groups is also very small (cadets = 6.17 and high school = 5.26). Indeed, they are so close that we can say (for the purposes of this work) that there is essentially no difference between them. As analysis of variance for all arrest variables
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indicates that no group differs significantly from another, the differences observed between groups could be due to chance. Regardless of the small differences, there is some difficulty in interpreting the meaning of the counts for this category. Resisting arrest can indicate both poor performance (too many resisting arrests may mean the officer is doing his/her job improperly) and good performance (it can also mean that the officer is willing to get involved and do even the most arduous tasks). Further, because college graduates have more total arrests (as we know from the previous analysis), it may simply be due to chance that college graduates have more resisting arrests. Hence, interpretation of the resisting arrests counts is ambiguous.

*Department Vehicle Accidents*

Regarding department vehicle accidents, high school graduates averaged the most (.93). Cadets had the second highest average number of accidents (.90). College graduates had the fewest mean number of accidents (.81). Again, however, the difference between these numbers is so small that these groups are essentially not different from each other. Thus, with respect to vehicle accidents all three groups have similar records, although college graduates do have the fewest accidents. Analysis of variance indicates that no group differs significantly from another ($p = .75$) when comparing department vehicle accidents.

*Civilian Complaints*

The fewest average number of civilian complaints made to the CCRB was also achieved by the college graduates (1.33), with cadets the middle group averaging 1.40 complaints. The high school graduates had the highest average number of complaints (1.50). These data are interesting because college graduates made the most arrests; therefore, one might expect more civilian complaints for them. This finding of the most arrests and the fewest civilian complaints is a strong indication of successful performance by the college only category.

Regarding force complaints, cadets had the fewest average number of force complaints (.91) followed by college graduates (.95) and then the high school only category (1.03). As high school graduates made the fewest arrests, we would expect less force complaints for them. This finding too is a strong indicator that cadets and college graduates are doing something different, which influences their performance in a favorable manner. A word of caution regarding the counts on civilian complaints is necessary. Both general counts and the force counts for each group are fairly close. In fact, we can say that all three groups did act quite similarly because the differences were
so small. Analysis of variance indicates that the difference in means is not statistically significant for either total number of complaints ($p = .87$) or force complaints ($p = .88$).

In sum, cadets performed better when it comes to promotion. College graduates, who were never cadets, were the least likely to have a problem with respect to sickness. College graduates and cadets performed similarly in having few indicators of poor performance and behavior problems (CPI points). Other indicators generally show that college graduates and cadets outperform the high school graduates; however, the differences between those indicators are, for the most part, small. Table 4 presents the average (mean) group performance for all categories.

### Table 4. Average (Mean) Group Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NYPD Indicator</th>
<th>Cadet</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>High School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total CPI Points*</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>8.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Arrests</td>
<td>69.90</td>
<td>70.03</td>
<td>59.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Felony Arrests</td>
<td>39.93</td>
<td>36.77</td>
<td>31.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Misdemeanor Arrests</td>
<td>28.16</td>
<td>31.80</td>
<td>25.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Violation Arrests</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Resisting Arrests</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>5.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Dept. Vehicle Accidents</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total CCRB Complaints</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Force Complaints</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Statistically significant difference ($p < .05$)

### Discussion

Overall, these simple relationships suggest that officers who are college graduates, including cadets, perform better than their high school graduate counterparts. The two groups, college graduates and cadets, performed better in nearly every category examined. This trend is clear and obvious throughout the data. Thus, the superior performance of these two groups does suggest that raising education requirements may prove fruitful.7

Nearly every dependent variable had some indication, albeit weak in many instances, that college educated officers (which includes cadets and the college category) perform at a higher level. As stated, previous research on the topic of education and policing has been mixed; however, this work suggests that college education is helpful to police agencies—at least in large, urban areas.
This research does suggest that former cadets now perform in a superior manner compared with high school graduate police officers; however, it is equally clear that cadets perform at a similar level compared with other college graduates with no Cadet Corps experience. Recall that the cadet study the Police Foundation conducted suggests cadets should be an “elite” corps of officers. These data do not support this characterization. Indeed, cadets definitely do not perform better than other college graduates except in certain areas such as rank that are offset by other areas such as sickness. Also, because extra seniority can affect rank, it may simply be that seniority (and not cadet performance) is responsible for earlier promotion. This work does recommend further study on this issue, especially with other cadet programs around the nation. Replication of this study will also help generalize these findings.

While further study is needed, some tentative policy recommendations can be made. The Cadet Corps program may help some poor and disadvantaged students achieve a higher education. Also, the Cadet Corps may be a good alternative to civil service to hire those who possess special skills to combat crime and/or terrorism (e.g., language skills such as Arabic). However, while the data show that cadet field performance is good, it is just about the same as other college (non-cadet) graduates.

This work suggests that the Cadet Corps’ goal of educating future officers on the systems, processes, and culture of the police department is a double-edged sword. On the one hand, after cadets become officers their familiarity with the department seems to improve performance in areas such as promotions. On the other hand, their familiarity with the department may lead to abuses such as taking more sick time.

At a minimum, the training and experiences cadets receive should be targeted toward learning appropriate behavior and the dangers of the police culture. It may be that untargeted exposure to cynical officers and other negative influences lead to unwanted behavior, actually hurting the organization.

By comparison civil service recruits are exposed to the culture in a controlled fashion. Indeed, training for new officers does not stop when they leave the Academy in New York City. In fact, hand-picked training officers introduce neophyte officers to the field environment. Because cadets were already exposed to the work environment by being assigned to the field before becoming police officers, it is probable that such non-controlled (or at least much less controlled) exposure has an adverse affect. That is, exposure to the police work environment without prior and rigorous Police Academy training and preparation as well as other controls after Academy graduation, such as hand-picked training officers who guide the neophyte properly, means that the cadet program may actually be less effective (if not actually causing harm) compared with civil service entry.
Some restructuring of these cadet programs is advisable. It may be that the familiarity that the Cadet Corps offers hurts as much as helps. It is suggested that cadet training focus on overcoming many of the negative aspects of the police culture (e.g., cynicism [see, for example, Drummond, 1976]), rather than introducing the cadets to the work environment without rigid controls in place. The Cadet Corps should try more rigorous training at the Academy before exposure, having a select group of experienced officers guide cadets in the field, developing a mentoring program where new cadets are shown the job by those already in the program (senior cadets should be selected to participate based on their ability to be a positive role model) as well as develop tests to determine when exposure seems to be negative (this can be informal through conversation with the cadets and/or formal through the use of a survey instrument so the program can be altered on a regular basis as is done for civil service recruits).

As a cautionary note (and a limitation of this study), any number of other factors this exploratory research did not examine might actually influence officers’ performance. For example, since this study focused on one very large department, it would seem obvious to suggest that the size of the department could play an important role in explaining these results. Larger departments may need officers who can accomplish tasks for which higher education is critical to performance. Enormous workloads, which are more typical in larger departments, may make education more critical.

Although this is an exploratory study, it clearly fills a gap in the research on cadet programs. Other than funded research by the Police Foundation, scant scientific study (exploratory or otherwise) is available. Future study should compare groups by using an experimental model (i.e., use of control groups with a strict sampling design). Additionally, future research might replicate the findings in this study and, more important, should address other important performance measures this study does not examine such as the officers’ ability to interact with the community. Future research should also examine whether cadet programs meet the needs of agencies, for example, by enabling them to hire officers with special language skills (e.g., Spanish, Arabic, etc.)

It would seem that similar quality officers can be obtained merely by raising entrance requirements or by working conjointly with colleges that have criminal justice (or similar) programs. Is the expense of a Cadet Corps worth it? The NYCPD Cadet Corps graduated approximately 723 persons who went on to become police officers (NYCPD, 1996, p. 10). The total cost per year for each cadet is $10,558 (NYCPD, 1996, p. 7). Thus, the cost to the city of New York for this program has been at least $7.5 million.

While this is an exploratory study with limitations as suggested though the work, clearly, this research demonstrates that college education is a critical component for officers in a post 9/11 environment. College educated officers tend to outperform those
without such education. Early exposure to the work environment, however, needs to be done very carefully so as to maximize advantages that a college education offers. To protect our citizens properly, college educated police officers seem an appropriate place to start.

Notes

1. The NYCPD uses several programs to hire cadets. Each of these programs has different criteria for selection (e.g., one program hired cadets with fewer than two years of college).

2. The New York City Department of Citywide Administrative Services gives a multiple choice test and then creates a hiring list from that test. The NYCPD (which is a separate and distinct city agency) then puts every recruit through its screening process. This is how a typical officer is hired.

3. However, pre-employment physical testing for the NYCPD was nonexistent from 1986 through 1994. Also, if the cadet took a medical screening examination within one year of appointment, he/she would not have to undergo that screening again.

4. Many more officers were hired during this period, but they are not included because their characteristics did not match. Also, to determine whom to include of the non-cadets, the researcher chose officers in descending order by tax number (an NYCPD number used to identify its officers) of those with the same characteristics.

5. Cadets have not been on the NYCPD long enough to attain any higher ranks.

6. Additionally, the Tukey-B test indicates that statistically significant differences occur between those who graduated college with the high school group and cadets and the high school group. Thus, college graduates and cadets are homogeneous subsets when comparing CPI points among the groups. That is, both the college graduates and cadets differ significantly from the high school group but do not differ significantly from each other.

7. However, these results were statistically significant for only three variables, namely, rank, CPI points, and sick occurrences. This indicates that many of these results could be due to mere chance. Additionally, the measures of association were modest, at best. This shows that the differences were not very strong. Thus, caution should be used in interpreting these results.

8. Alternatively, education may be masking other, possibly even more critical, factors that explain officers’ performance. That is, it may not be education per se that is the explanation for these results but, perhaps, discipline (those individuals who graduate college may be more disciplined) or even maturity levels (those that graduate college may be more mature). Thus, it could be that the education variable in this study is actually
measuring other criteria such as discipline or maturity levels. These factors and countless others could be part of the explanation for these results.
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